



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,682	12/31/2003	Ross Koningstein	16113-0632001	1976
26192 7590 09/22/2011 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER LE, KHANH H				
ART UNIT 3682		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 09/22/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,682	KONINGSTEIN, ROSS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KHANH LE	3682	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) KHANH LE (3) M. P. Shepherd, (telephonic)
 (2) Mark Kirkland, In person (4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 September 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☒102 ☒103 ☐Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Petropolous, Telaqon.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

See Continuation Sheet.

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☒ Attachment

/Khanh H. Le/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3682

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135 (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Applicant representatives faxed in some proposed amendment. See attached proposed claims.

As to the prior art, Mr. Shepherd explained that the invention is that there is no going back to the server between the 2 formats. Examiner stated that Petropoulos has the javascript thus reads on that feature. There is no agreement that Petropoulos does not disclose claim 1.

Mr. Kirkland stated that Applicant is willing to roll claim 30 into the independent claim in order to advance prosecution. The Examiner agreed that paragraph [0045] of Telagon is about ad rotation, not ad real estate so that paragraph [0045] of Telagon does not disclose claim 30. However, the Examiner will have to review other paragraphs of Telagon. Also, further supplemental search will have to be conducted.

As to claim 1, Examiner again raises 112(2P) and 112(1P) issues: in particular, Examiner questions what "where each menu option when selected causes.. the content items to be presented in the content portion" means.

Examiner noted that "the content portion" would be taken as discussed in the last Office Action at p. 4-5 as " the content portion of the expanded display format " which "is the area where items 260, 280 and 290 of Figure 2 reside". "These latter being the claimed "one or more content items".

Further, Examiner noted that, the following is understood, as discussed in the last office action, "Figure 7 shows display of the expanded format after selection of a menu option from the expanded format of Figure 2.... Menu options are items 230, 240 of Figure 2. Upon selection menu option 230 "pictures", the pictures "whales", "boats", "lighthouses"(the claimed "one or more associated content items" with the menu options) are shown adjacent to the expanded format, (item 200 of Figure 7) but not in the content portion of the expanded format, as claimed."

Mr. Shepherd said support for claim 1 is in Figures 5 and 6 in the specification, and not Figure 7, as the Examiner thinks. The 112(2P) and 112(1P) issues are not resolved. Applicants representatives agree to review the specification to improve on the language of claim 1 so it would be clear what each limitation means. The Examiner stated if Applicant points to specific support for each limitation of claim 1, it would advance prosecution. Mr. Shepherd and Mr. Kirkland agree to file for a 1 month extension and to resubmit a proposed amendment in October and discuss further with the Examiner at least to clarify the 112(2P) and 112(1P) issues. The Examiner also suggests that "creating" would be a better term than "generating". Mr. Kirkland agreed to the term. No other agreement was reached.